

I can only watch from a distance (several thousand miles), but I can see some of the effects of the US "incentive" licencing system on this

newsgroup, and also hear them on the air.

The "EXTRA" licence holders are split into two distinct populations:

- 1) People who have acquired a higher level of knowledge and skill because they want to use it.
- 2) People who worked to pass exams to gain access to some bits of bands forbidden to others, or just for the bragging rights, and make no real use of the enhanced level of knowledge they had to demonstrate, once.

Those in the first group are the sort of people who would increase their knowledge and skills anyway, for use in their hobby, without any need for formal certificates. They generate progress. They deserve encouragement, but they don't need it.

The second group should not be encouraged at all, those of them who just want some band segments as a form of exclusive club do nothing to enhance the hobby (nor do they do much damage) but those who pour scorn on those with lesser licences - actively discouraging them from continuing in the hobby.

Unfortunately, human nature causes the individuals in the second group to be far louder than those in the first group. Loudness is no indication of worth.

DavidGM4ZNX

Date: 17 Feb 1993 22:30:59 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Abandonment of CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C2HIA5.9sL@hpqmoea.sqf.hp.com>, dstock@hpqmoca.sqf.hp.com (David Stockton) writes:

- |> The "EXTRA" licence holders are split into two distinct populations:
- |>
- |> 1) People who have acquired a higher level of knowledge and skill
- |> because they want to use it.
- |>
- |> 2) People who worked to pass exams to gain access to some bits of

|> bands forbidden to others, or just for the bragging rights, and make no
|> real use of the enhanced level of knowledge they had to demonstrate,
|> once.
|>

|> The second group should not be encouraged at all, those of them who
|> just want some band segments as a form of exclusive club do nothing to
|> enhance the hobby (nor do they do much damage) but those who pour scorn
|> on those with lesser licences - actively discouraging them from
|> continuing in the hobby.
|>

|> Unfortunately, human nature causes the individuals in the second
|> group to be far louder than those in the first group. Loudness is no
|> indication of worth.

I very much disagree with this over simplification. Frankly, I feel that there was no specific SKILL or KNOWLEDGE that I gained (or was even covered) by the AMATEUR EXTRA test. It's written consists primarily about a bogus bunch of questions about satellites which I have zip interest in (and oddly enough the regs questioned are largely ignored by the dozen or so people in the US who actually put space stations into operation) or just rehashes of stuff on the earlier exams (we learn to use complex notation to indicate impedances that we were doing before just graphically).

I therefore must be in group 2. I primarily got it *because it was there*.

My main reasons:

1. Why stop at Advanced?
2. Wanted a four letter call.
3. Wanted to be a Volunteer Examiner.

I don't think that I've done anything to pour scorn on lesser licences, on the contrary, having a four letter call generally has lesser licences seeking me out as an expert (totally unwarranted) and I do my best to give assistance to them. Frankly, I think that the extra 25 MHz isn't going to make or break anyone. However, I believe that any one of the incentives (space operations, extra frequencies, VE privs, special calls) would not be enough to cause large number of people to upgrade. However the combination makes the effort worth it. Frankly I doubt many people would upgrade just to become VE's and the fact that many have upgraded for other reasons assures us of a decent number of VE's available.

Actually, there are loud mouths in any group, and I think it's rather bigotted to propose that people who want the "prestige" of an extra are messing up the hobby.

-Ron (Support the idea of Amateur Extra, just don't think it requires CW).

Date: 17 Feb 93 09:15:37 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!wupost!darwin.sura.net!news.duc.auburn.edu!eng.auburn.edu!
weltyrc@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

73 de Ryan KD4VZX

Date: 17 Feb 93 11:36:10 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!wupost!udel!gvls1!gvls2!ean@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <weltyrc.930217031537@wilbur.eng.auburn.edu> weltyrc@eng.auburn.edu
(Ryan C. Welty) writes:
>73 de Ryan KD4VZX
>

Is that a "yea" or a "nay"?

--
Ed Naratil
Amateur Packet: w3bnr@N3LA.#epa.PA.USA.NA (All standard disclaimers apply)
ean@VFL.Paramax.COM

Date: Wed, 17 Feb 1993 12:30:49 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!mpg!tony@ames.arpa
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <14600044@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com> alanb@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom)
writes:

>I say, eliminate the written exam entirely. Even the rules and
>regulations part -- nobody remembers that stuff anyway, and you can
>always look it up if you need to.

If you want to go to that extreme, you don't have to look very far for a radio
service that already caters to that philosophy and level of expertise. It's
called CB. You can then dump the first paragraph of part 97 and merge the CB
band into the ham bands and call it the same service.

On the other hand, if you want what we call 'amateur radio' to be a distinct

service from CB, one must have some criteria for it to be different and unique. The tests are just one aspect of that uniqueness. The different mode privileges are another.

There's more to amateur radio than just the fun of being a simple appliance operator and talking to your friends. Any effort to redefine the amateur radio service to be more CB-like would require a dialog with those hams whose activity in radio least resembles that of the CB operator. These hams would be the ones most adversely affected by the invasion of a new group of non-technical individuals into the spectrum we have.

Don't misunderstand me. I'm not saying that CB is bad - it has a unique and well-deserved place in the family of radio services. But the amateur radio service has its own niche also. That niche may need to be re-examined and refined once in a while but I wouldn't consider dumping all of the tests as a good way to start that redefinition.

--

Antonio Querubin

tony@mpg.phys.hawaii.edu / ah6bw@uhm.ampr.org / querubin@uhunix.bitnet

Date: 17 Feb 93 14:25:33 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <14600044@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com> alanb@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:

>A ham I know, KC6---, is the head of the local club's public service
>activities. She spends countless hours coordinating communications
>for parades, walkathons and races to the benefit of amateur radio
>and the local community. She is also a real nice person. Nobody I
>know would fail to agree that she is a credit to the hobby.

>

>But KC6--- is not a technical person. She admitted to me that she
>views ham equipment the same as her hi-fi. If she needs it fixed, she
>takes it to the shop. Her husband installed the radio in the car for
>her. She was able to memorize enough questions to pass the test, but
>has no further interest in technical subjects.

>

>There must be many people like her who could contribute to amateur
>radio but don't see the point in learning a lot of useless formulas.
>Back in the 1930's, the amateur exam required you to draw a schematic
>of your complete ham station and explain its operation to the
>government examiner. That made sense back then, when nearly everyone
>built his own station. Nowadays, the technical exam is an anachronism.

>
>But, you say, the exam acts as a "filter" to keep out undesirables!
>I say, go to any major metropolitan center in the US and tune across
>the 2 meter band. You know what you're looking for -- every major
>city has one (or several) -- the "garbage" repeater with foul
>language, frequent arguments, unidentified transmissions and
>intentional interference. If the present license exams are acting
>as a "filter," they sure aren't doing a very good job.
>
>I say, eliminate the written exam entirely. Even the rules and
>regulations part -- nobody remembers that stuff anyway, and you can
>always look it up if you need to.
>
>Amateur radio is dying on the vine -- we are becoming a hobby of old
>men. Young kids typically don't have much trouble with the code exam,
>but the written exam can be a real barrier. If we are to protect our
>frequencies before the FCC and Congress, we need to increase our
>numbers, and eliminating the written exam would be a giant step in
>that direction.
>
>By the way, all these arguments hold equally well for the code exam.
>If you believe the code exam should be eliminated, then the same
>arguments hold for the written exam as well.
>
>AL N1AL

I know you meant this as sarcasm, but it's still a valid point of view. I would not be troubled by an "appliance license" for those dedicated public service types who will never touch the insides of a radio. I would require an exam, open book would be fine, on the rules and regulations just to make sure the applicant understands that there are rules and regulations and how to look up and interpret them. I'd probably also throw in some questions on public service operating practices and recognition of RFI. I'd also specify that appliance licensees would not be authorized to build or modify equipment. But that is almost redundant for *any* class of amateur license today.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 17 Feb 93 21:16:42 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!caen!rphroy!link.ph.gmr.com!vbreault@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

(oh no... there's that familiar scraping sound as Val drags his
soapbox out of the closet. Sheesh... He's climbing up on it again.)

- 1) The exams are not all that difficult and could profit from some increase in technical content. This would be a point I would insist upon if one were to seek my endorsement of any proposal to reduce/remove the Morse code requirement.
- 2) People that can not or will not learn the technical and legal aspects of Amateur Radio may use one of a number of alternative radio services. There's business band, citizens band and cellular telephone to name three big ones.
- 3) "Real Hams" (tm) are obliged to elmer (tutor) prospective hams and other hams that wish to upgrade. If a suitable elmer cannot be found then there is a problem with the local Amateur Radio club and not with the prospective ham.
- 4) People value and protect more those things they work hard to obtain. An easily obtained license would not carry with it the pride of ownership that an Amateur Radio license currently carries. Such a document and the privileges it carries would be held in low esteem.
- 5) The fact that most amateurs can not draw a schematic of a multifunction, synthesized high-tech radio doesn't mean that the examinations should be dumbed down. This is as poor an argument as dumbing down the certification of commercial pilots because their planes are too complicated for one mere mortal to fully comprehend. It's as foolish as lowering the standards for high school graduation because some of the senior class can't read this note.

If there is a problem finding enough technically capable people to populate the airwaves then I ***STRONGLY*** suggest that the correct course of action would be to improve the educational system.

Dumbing down the examinations isn't like constructing ramps to accomodate the physically challenged. There's a difference... a big difference... Ignorance is not permanent. Ignorance can be cured.

I am walking talking testimony to the fact that ignorance can be overcome.

"Hello... my name is Val and I.... er... um... I'm a recovering ignoramus."

"Teach people to overcome ignorance." (Swell pun eh?)

--

-val-

Val Breault - GM Research - vbreault@gmr.com - N80EF
Instrumentation dept., 30500 Mound Rd., Warren, MI 48090-9055
The opinions expressed by the author do not necessarily reflect
those of GMR or those of the General Motors Corporation.

```
 \      /|  
  \    / |  
   \  /__|  
    \/_|___
```

Date: 17 Feb 1993 19:57:33 GMT
From: cronkite.cisco.com!dstine@ames.arpa
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <14600044@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com> alanb@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom)
writes:

>I say, eliminate the written exam entirely. Even the rules and
>regulations part -- nobody remembers that stuff anyway, and you can
>always look it up if you need to.

This is such twaddle.

If you want a no-code, no-test communication service, go get yourself some
gear, light it up on 27Mhz and have at it. Before you blether on about how the
exams don't serve as some form of effective filter, let's compare 27Mhz and
the HF ham bands. 27Mhz is a paradise for people who share your point of
view. And they share it regularly, with great vigor and effective radiated
power.

Oh, yes, let me ask you this: are people going to look up the reg & rules that
they no longer need to know to pass an exam _before_ or _after_ they break
them on the air?

>Amateur radio is dying on the vine -- we are becoming a hobby of old
>men.

I've listened to this, and listened to this, and listened to this. And here
is a little reality for you:

This is complete bullshit. American demographics IN GENERAL indicate that we

are a greying nation. The Baby Boomers are getting older. There is a delining birthrate among younger people of child-bearing age. There is a significant drop-off in population under 35, even more significant under the age of 25. People who keep saying that "amateur radio is becoming a hobby of old men" blithly ignore the fact that _everything_ in this country is becoming run by a more senior population.

> Young kids typically don't have much trouble with the code exam,

Well, huzzah! How about that. It would seem that the no-code and no-license people can't get their stories straight. First, the code test is a barrier to younger people and now you're telling me that kids don't have much trouble with the code exam. Make up your minds.

>but the written exam can be a real barrier.

Yet more twaddle. Barrier to _whom_? I passed the advanced exam in 1976 when I was 12. Because the exam pushed me to study math far in advance of what I was being taught in school, I was able to skip trig. I was able to design transistor oscillators by the time I was 16. Why? 'cuz the exams pushed me to crack the books.

The number of technically inclined kids out there is on the rise. And they don't have trouble with it. If technical things were such a hardship, please explain why there are so many high school kids who are so apt with computer programming and hacking.

>If we are to protect our
>frequencies before the FCC and Congress, we need to increase our
>numbers, and eliminating the written exam would be a giant step in
>that direction.

Yep. Certainly would. In the same vein as handing out welfare helps keep more and more people screaming at Congress that we need yet _more_ welfare. This is what your proposal smacks of. Let's get as many people into our midst so that we can use numbers rather than performance or accomplishments to lobby Congress.

>By the way, all these arguments hold equally well for the code exam.
>If you believe the code exam should be eliminated, then the same
>arguments hold for the written exam as well.

I might believe that the code exam should be removed, simply because it isn't as applicable to the current day technology as a sound knowledge of packet radio, spread spectrum and other modern communication technology. But your proposal to eliminate the written test entirely (including rules & regs) is the most egregious nonsense I've heard in a month of Sundays.

Nice sarcasm, Alan. Too bad it will be lost on a few.

Perry
AAOET

In article <103380022@hpfcs0.FC.HP.COM> perry@hpfcs0.FC.HP.COM (Perry Scott) writes:

Wonderful. Morse is easier *if* you're not dyslexic. I have yet to have heard of a Morse waiver for dyslexics, even though CW is *far* more difficult for a dyslexic than it is for someone who's motion-impaired. The quadraplegic may not be able to write or to send, but at least he can *understand* it. The dyslexic may not be able to receive, because the letters come in one-at-a-time, instead of in word-sized chunks...and consequently it makes no sense at all, even if he writes it down.

— —

[illegible]

---\ / Lee Michele Thompson-Herbert lee@soda.berkeley.edu >>>>>
\ /\ / "This is a job for CAPTIAN NAPALM!" >>>>
\ /Semper Bi "Ave Fortuna, Imperatrix Mundi!" >>>>

Date: 17 Feb 93 13:05:46 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!wupost!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!johnl@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: FCC proposal on receivers/scanners including cellular
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Feb12.170846.3241@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>
>I thought I posted this item to this newsgroup, but having seen not
>one follow-up, I think I may have missed doing so. I suggest all
>hams examine the FCC proposed rules carefully for possible impact
>on ham equipment...especially 900MHz transverters which could
>possibly be used as is or with minor modification to receive cellular
>frequencies in the 800MHz range.
>
>
>

This really scares me because it will probably have a direct impact
on ham radio. As pointed out above, much of the new 900 MHz equipment
can probably be modified easily to receive 800 MHz. The IC 2AT, and
possibly other transceivers, can receive the entire 800 MHz range.
These products will have to be redesigned. If they are not big
sellers, the manufacturers will probably just drop them.

This is a real threat. Please don't ignore it. Take a 5 minute
break from debating whether Morse code is a good or bad thing and
write to the FCC. We need to stop this or put in specific exemptions
for Amateur Radio equipment.

Whining about the idiots in Congress won't do any good but a half
million letters to the FCC pointing out the problems with Docket 93-1
can't be ignored.

So, if you want to express your concern about this issue, please
write a letter to the FCC. It will only take a few minutes. Here
is a rough draft of what I plan to send. Feel free to use it with
little or no modification.

73,
John Langner WB2OSZ
john1@avs.com

Comments on Docket No. 93-1

< Your address here >
Feb. 16, 1993

Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Commissioners:

After examining the text of Docket No. 93-1, I am convinced this proposed rule would NOT contribute to the stated objective of ensuring "the privacy of cellular telephone conversations."

Recent magazine articles on this topic indicate that there are already millions of scanning receivers in use that can receive frequencies in the 800 MHz range. The proposed law would not take effect for another year, providing ample opportunity for scanner manufacturers to sell many millions more.

Even if a scanner isn't capable of receiving signals in this frequency range, a simple converter can be used between the antenna and receiver to shift the frequency of the radio signals.

Trying to ban converters with 800 MHz in and some other frequency range out would be a futile effort. These are very cheap and simple circuits that any electronics hobbyist could build. Plans have been published in electronics magazines.

Besides having no benefits, this proposed rule creates several problems:

- (1) The technically ignorant public might get the idea their conversations are suddenly more secure. When they learn the truth they will be bitter and more distrustful of the telephone companies and government

agencies that deceived them.

(2) Privacy might even be reduced. Before the publicity on this topic, most people didn't realize it was so easy to listen to cellular phone calls. Many who never considered buying a scanner will run out and buy one during the next year.

(3) New regulations would place an unnecessary burden on electronics manufacturers who would have to change designs and have them recertified.

(4) It would set an unfortunate precedent. If we have a ban on receivers capable of receiving a certain range of frequencies, other businesses will expect the same treatment for "their" frequencies.

(5) The regulations could hit unintended targets. For example the 902 MHz band is now experiencing explosive growth for low power commercial and "ham" applications. Surely much of this equipment could easily be modified to pick up signals in the 800 MHz range even if the manufacturer didn't design it with that intention.

I'm all for guarding the privacy of cellular telephone conversations but this is not the way to do it. There is only one solution. The cellular telephone companies must make encryption options available.

In summary, I urge the Commission to reject the proposed regulations in Docket 93-1 because they would create many problems without making any progress toward the stated goal.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Yours truly,

< Your name here >

--

Date: Wed, 17 Feb 1993 10:15:40 GMT

From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!sdd.hp.com!apollo.hp.com!

hpwin052!hpqmoea!dstock@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Kevin Purcell used the UK as an example of a place outside the control of the FCC, where "there is no specification or charter for amateur radio". I don't have my licence here with me, so the wording has to come from memory, but it does clearly state that the purpose is for "self training in wireless telegraphy" and it specifies most precisely what I am and am not allowed to do.

My licence is a legal document granting permission (a charter ?) specifying in detail what radio amateurs in this country are allowed to do, and also gives a good description for the reason why our government graciously issues such documents.

Nits now picked, I must agree that " Amateur radio is a service chartered by the FCC...." is a rather parochial statement. I thought that one of the joys of amateur radio was in discovering friends in other countries.....

I suppose it must have been a slip of the tongue, but managing to stir up every country in the world but one shows class :-)

(one benefit of life in the UK is that the Tax Form is much easier, although the tax rates are somewhat higher :-)

Cheers

David GM4ZNX

Date: Wed, 17 Feb 93 15:46:56 GMT
From: qualcom.qualcomm.com!walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Vero Beach stop transmitting order by judge
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Several days ago someone posted a synopsis of a situation in Vero Beach, Florida. The bottom line at the moment (as best I recall) is that a local amateur radio operator who has been involved in a lawsuit about his radio antenna tower has been ordered to (1) remove the tower and (2) stop ALL transmissions from his home.

I responded to that with a request as to the existence of a legal defense fund for the ham in question. I've yet to

see any follow-up, but I know my post made it to the newsgroup because at least one other person emailed me for info if I knew anything more (I don't). So, let's forget the no-code wars, here's a direct threat at the ability of hams to even transmit as ordered by a Florida judge. If that stands, we're all in deep trouble.

SO.....

(1) Is there any more info on this case available? If so, would someone please keep us all up-to-date on what is happening please? (I'll do it myself if I knew who to contact.)

(2) Is there a legal defense fund for this ham?

(3) Is the ARRL and W5YI informed on the situation?

Now just to point out the worst case possibility here and elsewhere, just think of all the folks who are now being scared silly because of the media focus on RF (cellphone usage, living near power lines, living near transmitter sites, etc.) and electromagnetic fields as possible cancer causes. If you don't think there's at least several thousands of extremists out there that would outlaw ham radio transmission immediately just because they think it might be a health threat, then you sadly underestimate the possibilities.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: 18 Feb 93 01:24:30 GMT

From: usc!wupost!uwm.edu!logicse!sequent!muncher.sequent.com!edw@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <weltyrc.930217031537@wilbur.eng.auburn.edu>,
<1993Feb17.113610.12372@VFL.Paramax.COM>,
<weltyrc.930217113308@wilbur.eng.auburn.edu>
Subject : Re: Eliminate the Written Exam

Yes!

Eliminate the written exam!

Eliminate the code test!
Make all transmitters covers ALL frequencies!
Make it a service for all citizens!

Hi thereah gud buddy, ah got mah linyear footwarmer, and mah slider all
warmed up. I jus hope the funny circle company knoocking,
BECAUSE WE THE LOADEST STATION IN THE NATION!

WHISTLE WHISTLE

Play a few songs with massive overmodulation
Hey Thar breaker break ya'll heah me ?
Talk about getting laid and doing dope for a while
BECAUSE WE THE LOADEST STATION IN THE NATION!

WHISTLE WHISTLE

Repete above for 30 to 40 minutes

And thats just the CQ call

Yeah sure , we really need the changes .
If you want amateur privlidges then it is reasonable to work for them.
Else scoop out half your brains and migrate to 11 metres.

Please note that there are zero smileys in this post.
If the foo shits wear it !

Ed (I remember when you could use CB, say back in 65) Wright

--

-- I think I've got the hang of it now :w :q :wq :wq! ^d X exit ^X^C ~.
^[x X Q :quitbye CtrlAltDel ~~q :~q logout save/quit :!QUIT ^[zz ^[ZZ
ZZZZ ^H ^@ ^L ^[c \$q ^# ^E ^X ^I ^T ? help helpquit ^D ^d ^C ^c help
^]q exit ?Quit ?q anybackbone!sequent!edw edw@sequent.COM KA9AHQ 28.340

Date: 17 Feb 93 17:33:08 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!wupost!darwin.sura.net!news.duc.auburn.edu!eng.auburn.edu!
weltyrc@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <14600044@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com>,
<weltyrc.930217031537@wilbur.eng.auburn.edu>,
<1993Feb17.113610.12372@VFL.Paramax.COM>
Subject : Re: Eliminate the Written Exam

That's the last line of a post that didn't quite occur. It was a hell no, that
we need to keep the written exam in order to keep from becoming cb radio. I
understand the arguements for making it easier for people to become hams, but
I know I myself would have made a total fool of myself on the air if it wasn't

for the stuff I picked up studying for the test. The tests for nocode tech (Yes, I'm a mere poser ham) are already easy enough. I'll agree that there may be more technical stuff than necessary, but those are the questions I can get right, while I can't spew out a single frequency allocation other than 2m. We just have to help people that want to become hams to pass the written tests. Honestly, they're just not that difficult.

---Ryan, KD4VZX

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #42
